

## Ideation Phase

### Literature Survey On The Selected Project & Information Gathering

<b>Date</b>	<b>19 September 2022</b>
<b>Team ID</b>	<b>PNT2022TMID46206</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Web Phishing Detection</b>
<b>Maximum Marks</b>	<b>4 Marks</b>

### Literature Survey on Smart Lender-Applicant Credibility Prediction for Loan Approval

<b>S.No</b>	<b>Authors</b>	<b>Contribution Summary</b>	<b>Weakness</b>	<b>Mechanism</b>	<b>Algorithms</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Abu-Nimehet al. [84]</b>	<b>Prove that there is no standard classifier for phishing email prediction</b>	<b>More features consume more time and memory</b>	<b>Compared six classifiers relating to machine learning</b>	<b>LR, CART, SVM, NNET, BART.</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Miyamotoet al. [83]</b>	<b>Comparison of machine learning algorithms To Detect phishing</b>	<b>The observed-measure is still low</b>	<b>Detect phishing website based on 3,000 website data</b>	<b>Adaboost</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Ram Basnet 2008[85]</b>	<b>Discover phishing email attacks with very narrow prior knowledge</b>	<b>Using offline algorithms It has a low level of accuracy</b>	<b>Compared multiple classifiers algorithma Clustering Technique With 16</b>	<b>Adapted Svm Nnet Soms Nnet</b>

				<b>features</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Gansteretal .[77]</b>	<b>Established 15 new online and offline features</b>	<b>Higher cost because of online fearures</b>	<b>Make comparison Between binary and Temary Classification apporaches</b>	<b>SVM</b>